DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 654 UD 021 172

AUTHOR Scout, Terrence H.
TITLE School Desegregation to Integration Through Changes in Social Structure.
PUB DATE Sep 76
NOTE 31p.: Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (71st, New York, NY, September, 1976).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Desegregation; *Competition; Desegregation Effects; Desegregation Methods; Elementary Secondary Education; Grades (Scholastic); *Group Dynamics; *Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Group Unity; Intergroup Relations; Literature Reviews; *Racial Relations; *Rewards; School Desegregation; Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS Coleman (James S); Pettigrew (Thomas F); Samuels (Frederick); Sherif (Muzafer)

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the theoretical and research contributions of many authors concerning group status and intergroup relations. Highlighted are: (1) Coleman's insights on the classroom reward structure; (2) Pettigrew's principles for successful ethnic contact; (3) Sherif's experimental work on the reduction of intergroup hostility through the pursuit of superordinate goals; and (4) Samuels' observations on the distribution of rewards within competitive and cooperative groups. It is suggested that in order to facilitate intergroup relations in a classroom situation, students be allowed to compete for grades in racially mixed work teams with rewards dispensed on the basis of the accomplishments of the group rather than the individual. These changes in classroom grouping procedures and classroom reward structures, it is argued, should create in-group feelings in the members of the various work teams which cut across ethnic identities. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NOV 2 1 1980

ED200654

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION TO INTEGRATION THROUGH CHANGES IN SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Terrence H. Scout

University of North Carolina

at

Charlotte

A paper prepared for presentation at the 71st Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, September, 1976, in New York, New York.

My sincere gratitude is extended to Jane Mercer and Eldon Wegner for their very helpful comments on earlier drafts.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terence H. Scout

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD021172

School Desegregation to Integration through Changes in Social Structure

Abstract

A combination of Coleman's insights on the classroom reward structure, Pettigrew's principles for successful ethnic contact, Sherif's experimental work on the reduction of intergroup hostility, and Samuels' observations on the distribution of rewards within the various types of competitive and cooperative groups provides a framework for constructive changes in the normative structure of the school. These changes are made in order to move a school from desegregation to integration.

School Desegregation to Integration through Changes in Social Structure

When faced with a choice between segregation and desegregation, many Americans, regardless of ethnic group, increasingly choose segregation because desegregation, they feel, is not worth the price. And even those Americans who choose desegregation ask that it be defined as a removal of legal barriers rather than as a promotion of ethnic mixing merely for the sake of group balance (Harris, 1975).

However, the choice is not simply between segregation and desegregation; there is a third alternative -- integration. Desegregation is the assignment of students by ethnic group to schools and within such schools in order to achieve "ethnic balance." Integration occurs when the members of the various ethnic groups, now physically together, share equal statuses and roles within the system, share equally positive attitudes about themselves and each other, and have acquired friends from all ethnic groups.

Desegregation merely provides the opportunity for contact between the members of the various ethnic groups. This contact may or may not lead to integration. Reviews of the literature on school desegregation show that "studies of the effect of contact on the formation of friendship and the reduction of prejudice are somewhat inconclusive (St. John, 1964, p. 328)." "Some have found that, with contact, there is more interracial acceptance, less prejudice, and a raising of Negro self-esteem. Other

studies have not supported these findings, noting instead that there is less interracial acceptance (Carithers, 1970, p. 36)."

It has been suggested that the reason for the different findings is because the contact situations differ in type and structure. Those studies which report no difference or less inter-ethnic acceptance are usually studies of situations which merely provided the opportunity for contact between different ethnic groups without a concrete plan for the reduction of inter-ethnic tensions through contact. Desegregation as a contact situation appears to be a necessary but not a sufficient condition for integration. Using studies of successful contact situations as a guide, what type of contact or program is a sufficient condition for integration? Or in the terminology of group dynamics, how does one enlarge the in-group concept of the members of each ethnic group so that ethnic identity is no longer a basis for distinguishing between in-group and out-group members?

ETHNIC CONTACT

The Robbers Cave Experiment

Research on the reduction of intergroup conflict was conducted by Muzafer Sherif and his colleagues (1961) in Sherif's "Robbers Cave" experiment. In the summer of 1954, Sherif brought twenty-two boys to a summer camp in Oklahoma. The background of the boys was very similar (same SES level, ethnicity, etc.) and the boys did not know one another prior to the camp. After arriving at the camp the boys were divided into two groups of eleven boys each.

In the first state of the experiment the groups went their separate ways. Each group engaged in activities which were pleasant and which required some organization by the boys, such things as improving their swimming hole, preparing meals outside, etc. At the end of one week, the twenty-two individuals had become two distinct in-groups with their own friendship patterns, hierarchal status structure, and set of norms. Each group gave itself a name, "Rattlers" and "Eagles," a clear indication that separate identities had developed.

In stage two the Rattlers and Eagles were brought together to engage in a series of contests: baseball games, tug-of-war competitions, cabin inspections, a treasure hunt, etc. The group which received the most points for all the contests was awarded a trophy, medals, and knives.

Both groups reacted to the contests very competitively. They found that the other group often frustrated their desire to win. As Sherif had hypothesized, this series of competitive and frustrating contests led to intergroup hostility. Hostility crystallized in derogation of the out-group through verbal abuse, unfavorable stereotypes, physical violence such as cabin raids and fights, and social distance such as refusing to eat with the out-group.

In the third stage of the study, Sherif tried to reduce and hopefully even to eliminate the intergroup conflict. One method for reducing intergroup conflict is the pleasant activity approach. Groups are brought into contact to engage in activities which are pleasurable but which do not require cooperation between the groups. In his 1949 experiment Sherif demonstrated that this method has little or no effect on the reduction of intergroup hostility. Since this approach had not lost its appeal, Sherif tried

it again in the Robbers Cave experiment. The two groups were brought together for meals and to watch movies, activities which were pleasant and in which the participants acted as individuals. This type of contact produced intensified intergroup hostility. The Rattlers and Eagles threw food at each other and called each other names.

After trying the pleasant activity approach, Sherif introduced superordinate goals to the groups. Superordinate goals are problem situations which produce a state of perceived interdependence between the groups because the resources and energies of any single group are inadequate for solving the problem. The first situation consisted of stopping the water supply into the camp by clogging the main water line. In order to solve the problem, the boys had to cooperate in finding the source of the problem and then in repairing it. The Rattlers and Eagles both wanted to see the movie "Treasure Island," but neither group had enough money to pay the rental fee to bring it to camp. The solution was simple but required cooperation, pooling their money. The third opportunity for superordinate goal attainment occurred when the boys were having a camp-out. The truck which was to bring the boys their food got stuck and would not start. Neither group had enough strength to start the truck moving, but together they could accomplish it.

Participation in achieving the superordinate goals described above eliminated physical altercations between the two groups, significantly reduced derogatory stereotypes and verbal abuse, and also reduced significantly the amount of social distance exhibited by the groups through increases in outgroup friendship choices and partners for meals.

Sherif demonstrated that intergroup conflict can virtually be eliminated when the groups strive for superordinate goals, situations of cooperative interdependence. Unfortunately there has not been an attempt to replicate Sherif's experimental work and for the most part the results of the Robbers Cave experiment have been ignored.[1] One of the major theorists in the area of inter-ethnic relations, Thomas Pettigrew, merely mentions Sherif in passing.

Theoretical Contributions of Thomas Pettigrew

Pettigrew's theoretical contributions to the field of ethnic relations consist mainly of his expanding on the work of Robin Williams (1947) and Gordon Allport (1954). The fruit of this expansion is that Pettigrew comes to the conclusion that through contact positive ethnic relations are enhanced "when the two groups (1) possess equal status, (2) seek common goals, (3) are cooperatively dependent upon each other, and (4) interact with the positive support of authorities, laws or customs (1971, p. 275)."

Both Allport (1954) and Pettigrew (1971) provide extensive citations of ethnic contact which did not reduce tensions between the two groups and their ex post facto explanation is that the contact was not between people of equal status. Robin Williams predated Allport and Pettigrew when he stressed the importance of equal status contact in 1947. Although there is much agreement that equal status contact is important for the reduction of ethnic hostility, there is little agreement as to whether the status of the participants can be equal only within the contact situation or must also be equal in the society at large.

Williams used the term "functional equals" (1947, p. 69), a term which leads to the conclusion that he was referring to equal status within the contact

situation. This definition seems to be a more realistic approach to the problem. If there is ethnic stratification in the larger society, then it is extremely difficult to bring together members of different ethnic groups who have equal status in society.

If ethnicity is a "diffuse status characteristic" (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972), then it would be impossible to bring together equal status members of different ethnic groups on even a small scale basis. A diffuse status characteristic is one which 1) is differentially valued in society, 2) is associated with a set of specific abilities, and 3) arouses general expectations for relative competence. Clearly, different states of ethnicity are differentially valued in American society, Anglo is a higher status than non-Anglo. In negative terms, non-Anglo states of ethnicity are associated with low cognitive abilities which arouse general expectations of incompetence on academic tasks.

It is the theoretical contention (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972), supported by research studies (Cohen & Roper, 1972; Lohman, 1972; Cohen, 1973; Freese & Cohen, 1973; Cohen, Lockheed, & Lohman, 1972), that general expectations for Anglo competence and non-Anglo incompetence on academic tasks are based upon the diffuse status characteristic of ethnicity. In situations of Anglo - non-Anglo interaction the actors, regardless of ethnic group or level of individual competence, expect a lower level of participation both in quantity and quality by the non-Anglo actors. Accordingly, the non-Anglo actors fulfill these expectations. Cohen (1972) uses the term "interracial interaction disability" to refer to the negative expectations that exist for the diffuse status characteristic of ethnicity in the non-Anglo states.

Cohen (1972) argues that this "disability" is so pervasive in society that equal status contact cannot be achieved, even within the contact situation, without direct intervention that alters the expectation states of all parties to the interaction. To treat the expectation states of students in desegregated schools is indeed a monumental task. While it is true that such a task has been achieved (Lohman, 1972; Cohen, 1973; Cohen, Lockheed & Lohman, 1976), it has been accomplished only in short summer programs, with smaller numbers of students than would occupy a normal school, and on an experimental basis. Therefore, although this third conception of equal status contact may be the most theoretically justifiable, it simply is not practical on a large scale at this time.

Regardless of how one defines a status equal contact, the question remains why is this a necessary part of the contact situation. Citing the work of Rokeach and Triandis, Pettigrew stated that "people of equal status are more likely than others to possess congruent outlooks and beliefs simply by virtue of their common positions in society. Second, equal status situations provide an optimal setting in which this congruence can be perceived (1971, p. 276)"

Rokeach and Mezei (1966) argue that one ethnic group is prejudiced against another ethnic group not because of skin pigmentation or language per se but because the out-group's values and belief system are perceived by the in-group as being different and "wrong." The in-group rarely gets beyond the skin pigmentation of the out-group to discover if their perceptions of the out-group's belief system are accurate. The contact situation allows in-group members to get beyond the external characteristics of the out-group

members and to understand their belief system. Equal status contact increases the chances that the belief systems of the participants will be similar.

Common goals was the second characteristic for a successful contact situations cited by Pettigrew. However, this characteristic does not seem to be sufficient in and of itself. As Sherif demonstrated in both the Robbers Cave experiment and in his 1949 experiment the pleasant activities of watching a movie and eating enjoyable food together which involved the common goal of enjoyment heightened rather than reduced intergroup conflict.

Therefore, common goals must be pursued in conjunction with the fourth characteristic, cooperative dependence. Unfortunately, Pettigrew does not make it clear why this is so. To support his position he argues that pursuit of a common goal may involve competition and surely that condition cannot be expected to reduce intergroup conflict. Thus the justification for the inclusion of cooperative dependence as a condition of contact is to eliminate the situation involving pursuit of a common goal under conditions of competition. Eliminating competition does not necessarily promote cooperation, Sherif has shown that the mere absence of competition did not lead to better intergroup relations. The concept of superordinate goals requires that groups function with cooperative interdependence.

The last charactertistic of a successful contact situation according to Pettigrew is that the groups interact with the positive support of the authorities. While Pettigrew does not offer any empirical support for the inclusion of this characteristic, several other researchers (Yarrow, Campbell, & Yarrow, 1958; Lohman; 1972; Cohen, 1973; Cohen, Lockheed, & Lohman, 1976) do offer such support. If attitudes which are unfavorable toward an

out-group are more a product of the normative system of the in-group rather than of the personality system of its members, then a change in the normative system through authoritative sanctions should make it easier for successful inter-group contact.

This review of Sherif's research and Pettigrew's theory lead to the conclusion that positive ethnic relations can be enhanced through contact when the two groups possess equal status, at least within the contact situation and that chances for success are greatly improved if the equal status extends to society in general; and when they function in a cooperatively interdependent manner to achieve superordinate goals.

Contact in Non-School Settings

In studies of public housing projects (Deutsch & Collins, 1951; Wilner, Walkley, & Cook, 1952; Works, 1961), it was found that white housewives in desegregated projects had more favorable attitudes towards blacks than did white housewives in segregated projects. The project participants had equal status within the contact situation and since the project was only for low income groups it can be assumed that they had equal status in society as well.

A New York State anti-discrimination law which led to the hiring of blacks in department stores provided Harding and Hogrefe (1952) with an opportunity to study contact in a different setting. They found that those white employees who had had equal status contact, within the situation, showed the greatest willingness to work with blacks, followed by those who had had unequal status contact. The least favorable reaction was found among those white workers who had had no contact with black workers. Kephart (1957) in his study of policemen and Palmore (1955) in his study of meat packers came to about the same conclusion.

Stouffer and his colleagues (1949) also found in their studies of soldiers during World War II that increased contact led to increased acceptance. Intergroup acceptance was higher in combat units than in non-combat units. It can be safely assumed that combat conditions require more cooperative interdependence than do non-combat situations. Not only does this finding lend support to both the contact and equal status hypotheses but also to the hypothesis of cooperative interdependence. Stouffer's findings were confirmed by Moskos (1966) in his study of soldiers during the Korean War and also by Brophy (1945) in his study of the merchant marine.

A different pattern emerges in studies of non-project housing. Kramer (1950) and Winder (1952) studied attitudes of whites in areas which were experiencing the ecological invasion of blacks. They found that whites in residential areas which were mixed ethnically had more unfavorable attitudes toward blacks than did whites in areas which were not so mixed. In addition, Widner found that low status whites were the ones who had the most hostile attitudes toward blacks even though the blacks in question were also low status. Widner's explanation for this was that both groups were in competition for the limited amount of low income housing available. Neither contact per se nor equal status contact produced more favorable ethnic attitudes under conditions of competition.

Yarrow, Campbell, and Yarrow (1958) conducted a camp experiment in which they brought children together in a situation free of external distractions. The children were of both sexes, ranged in age from eight to thirteen, and were mixed ethnically. At the end of a two-week period they found that inter-

ethnic friendships had increased among cabin mates, but in broader activities the groups exhibited more segregation. They concluded that no major shifts in ethnic attitudes had occurred. The variable which they found to be most important in their experiment was not equal status contact but the role of the adult camp leader in defining equalitarian norms.

It can be seen that studies of contact between different groups present a mixed picture. Sometimes the results are positive; sometimes they are not. This lends support to the idea that it is not contact per se but the type of contact, including both the conditions under which the contact takes place and the status of the participants, which is important (Williams, 1964; Amir, 1969).

CLASSROOM REWARD STRUCTURE

So far contact situations between groups have been discussed, but studies of school classrooms rarely recognize such contact. Instead they concentrate on contact between individuals. The United States' culture places a strong emphasis on individualism and this emphasis is nurtured and reinforced by the reward structure of the classroom.

Theoretical Insights

James Coleman (1959) claims that the traditional reward structure in which students compete against each other for grades actually serves to impede the educational goals of the school system. Under a system of individual rewards for achievement, the high achievement of one student does nothing for the group as a whole and serves as a source of anxiety for certain members of the group. The group response is to discourage

achievement above a certain level in order that the norms for achievement can be reached by all. This forces the high achiever to choose between seeking rewards from the adult authority figures or seeking rewards from his peer group. Most high achievers pick the latter rewards while maintaining a performance level that does not incur punishment from the adult authority.

Coleman contrasts the academic reward system with the reward system for inter-scholastic athletics. He reports that good athletes are held in higher regard by their peers than are good students (1961). In athletics a superior performance by an individual rewards that individual, the team, and the school as a whole. It is to the advantage of the superior athlete to help the inferior team member and it is also to the advantage of the inferior athlete to encourage achievement on the part of the superior team member.

Coleman concludes that it may be wise to change the traditional classroom reward structure if one wants to encourage academic achievement. This change should, in his opinion, be along the same lines as the athletic reward structure; that is toward a "team" concept. If academic achievement were rewarded in that manner, then it is posited that informal peer group norms would reinforce the norms of the adult authorities and encourage rather than impede the goals of the educational system. One can easily extend Coleman's ideas concerning group reward structures to include not only academic achievement but any goal which the educational system feels is desirable, e.g. inter-ethnic attitudes and behaviors.

According to Urie Bronfenbrenner (1970), Coleman's theoretical ideas have already been put into practice. The educational system of the Soviet Union

uses group reinforcement to foster desirable behavior and attitudes in the young.

One of the goals that the Soviet schools seek to achieve is that of making the child an effective member of the collective. Collective groups are forged into effective forces by the use of competition between successive levels of collectives, but within each level cooperation is emphasized. Each student's success and status in school are dependent in part on the status of the collective group of which he is a member. Recognition for achievement is given either to the group as a whole or to the individual for his contribution to the group, but rarely to the individual student apart from the group. Therefore, it becomes functional for the individual to cooperate and help others within the group in order to receive recognition. Bronfenbrenner reports that this type of classroom reward structure is successful in making the child an effective member of the collective or in creating an in-group.

Empirical Evidence on Competition versus Cooperation[2]

Deutsch (1968) called a cooperative situation in which one person's goal can only be reached if the other individuals in the group also work toward the same goal a "promotively interdependent group." A situation may also exist in which one individual can reach a goal only if others do not reach it. This he termed a "contriently interdependent group." Deutsch found that his promotively interdependent group showed greater coordination of efforts, greater achievement pressure, greater orderliness, greater quality and quantity of product, greater friendliness, and greater incorporation of the attitudes of the group.

Gottheil (1955) used cooperative grouping versus individual competition and found that the cooperative group was more accepting of those with whom they had cooperated and of others in general.

Myers (1962) studied the adjustment of group members under intergroup competition and non-competition and under conditions of success and failure. He found that members of competitive groups were better adjusted. They had more esteem for their fellow team members, perceived more favorable relationships among team members, and were more tolerant of other team members who were absent even though such absences were detrimental to group success. The competitive groups did not tend to hold their members responsible for failure. Even competitive groups which were low in success were better adjusted than low success non-competitive teams. Competition brought better personal adjustment whether the groups were successful or not.

In another study Dunn and Goldman (1966) used four different experimental groups: 1) group competition with within-group cooperation and between group competition; 2) individual competition with both within and between group competition; 3) group merit with within group cooperation and no competition; and 4) individual merit with no competition or cooperation of any kind. The group merit subjects were significantly more accepting of in- and non-group members than group competition members. They concluded that there are advantages to having group members cooperate and share rewards without competing against either each other or against another group. Intergroup rivalry did not seem to be necessary to produce group cohesiveness.

While intergroup competition may not be necessary to produce a cohesive group, Julian, Bishop, and Fiedler (1966), found that intragroup cooperation in combination with intergroup competition among military work groups promoted close inter-personal relationships among group members and improved their morale and general adjustment. Also the intergroup competition did not seem to interfere with satisfactory performance on tasks.

Julian and Perry (1967) differentiate between cooperation among group members and competition between groups in order to see if the effects which in the past had been attributed to group cooperation might have been in reality due to intergroup competition. They used three experimental conditions or groups. In the first, individual group members competed, but groups did not compete. In the second, individual group members cooperated and groups as a whole competed against other groups. In the third, individual group members cooperated and there was no competition between groups. They found that subjects were higher in motivation and were more productive under both individual and group competition than under pure cooperation. The performance of the individual competition group was higher in quality and quantity, but group competition and pure cooperation produced groups which were warmer, more relaxed in nature, and had more positive inter-personal relations. They concluded that cooperation among group members, without intergroup competition, produced a positive atmosphere but did not tend to foster high productivity.

Several recent studies bear directly on the classroom reward structure. Wodarski, et al. (1973) report "that group-shared consequences are more effective than individual consequences in producing peer tutoring and facilitating acquisition or learning (p. 288)." Devries and Edwards (1973)

found that team competition (intra-group cooperation, intergroup competition) produced a higher rate of peer tutoring and peer pressure on team members for involvement than did individual competition. Teams created a more cohesive group and greater mutual concern for group members. Under controlled conditions in the classroom team rewards have been found to have a positive effect on cross ethnic selections (Devries & Edwards, 1974).

The findings of these studies do not fall into a clear pattern because the definition of terms and operationalization of concepts are neither precise nor consistent. The most consistent finding is that competition between groups seems to have more positive outcomes than competition between individuals. The inconsistent findings can be explained by the distribution of rewards under the group structure. Can more positive outcomes be achieved through an equalitarian distribution of rewards whereby all members of a group receive the same reward or through a relative distribution of rewards whereby each member of the group gets a share of the reward commensurate to his contribution to the group's performance? Although Coleman favors group competition within the classroom, he does not discuss the distribution of rewards within the group.

Frederick Samuels (1970) delineates four types of groups involving cooperation and competition. These types are based on the distribution of rewards among the individuals within the group and on the group's dependence for a reward on other groups. A group may be either intra-competitive or intra-cooperative with no competition for rewards between groups (inter-cooperative). Also a group may be intra-competitive or intra-cooperative with competition for rewards between groups (inter-competitive).

Originally Samuels had hypothesized that the intra-cooperative and inter-competitive group would show the most positive results. However, in groups

> "where each member shares equally in the reward, the task leader ... may be seen as resenting the fact that the lesser achievers receive as much of the reward as does he ... the non-leaders ... may feel a certain degree of guilt if they feel that they have not done their share of work and yet are being rewarded along the leader ... In the (intra- and inter-competitive group) there is no necessity for resentment on the part of the leader, for here the greatest achiever receives the greatest reward. The other ... members concomitantly need have no guilt feelings with respect to the division of the reward ... the lesser achievers are likely to appreciate the leader who has aided them in receiving some reward and also to respect him ... ."
>
> (Samuels, 1970, p. 395; emphasis removed)

In retrospect Samuels felt that the findings were understandable, since our culture stresses individual competition and reward. An additional explanation which is supportive of Coleman is that most athletic teams are inter- and intra-competitive. Most players want to be the star on a winning team, competition within competition. Samuels' classification of groups helps to separate the various types of cooperation and competition and provides a framework for viewing the previous studies.

OUTCOMES OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Few studies of school desegregation (Weinberg, 1970a, 1970b; St. John, 1975) concentrate on inter-ethnic interactions and their effect on inter-ethnic attitudes and behaviors. The overwhelming majority of such studies are concerned with the effects of school desegregation on academic achievement. Lewis and St. John (1974) report that there is a relationship between inter-ethnic interactions and academic achievement. However, they are not certain about the direction of the causal relationship between the two variables.

Following is a review of school desegregation studies which have been done since 1954 and which speak to the effect of inter-ethnic contact on the inter-ethnic attitudes and behaviors of students in junior and senior high schools.

Campbell (1958) studied white eighth, tenth, and twelfth graders, and found that their attitudes became more negative after school desegregation. Campbell tested the same hypothesis in two different ways by changing the operational definition of the independent variable. First, he defined equal status contact as personal friendship. Defined in this way equal status contact did lead to positive attitudes. Second, he defined equal status contact as the number of classes with black students. Defined in this manner equal status contact did not lead to attitude changes.

Campbell's second definition of equal status contact is really the opportunity for such contact. He did not measure the interaction directly, merely the opportunity for such interaction. His first definition leaves unanswered the question of why the personal friends of some students are of a different ethnic group than their own?

Webster's study (1961) of black and white seventh graders in a newly desegregated school in the San Francisco Bay area also did not show positive results. He measured the attitudes of the newly desegregated students before and after and also the attitudes of two control groups, the students in an all white high school and the students in an all black high school. He found that the desegregated white students had significantly more negative attitudes toward black students after desegregation and were significantly more negative than the white control group. The attitudes of the black students toward white students were significantly more positive after desegregation and more positive than the black control group.

A re-analysis of the Coleman Report by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1967) and by McPartland (1968) both found that apparently equal status contact does have a positive effect on ethnic attitudes, since a preference for desegregated schools and for friends from other ethnic groups was positively related to the number of years a student had been in desegregated schools. McPartland found this latter finding to be true for whites but not for blacks. Also black students chose white students as friends more often as the percentage of white classmates rose.

Armor (1972) reported that the attitudes of the bused black students in the METCO schools in the Boston area became significantly more separatist in one year and that these students interacted with white students less often. Thus opportunity for contact did not produce such contact.

The five studies reviewed above all present the possibility of equal status contact within the school setting. They do not discuss the possibility of cooperation or competition being present. However, it may be safely assumed that all of the situations involved competition and not cooperation. Since no specific mention of the reward structure within the

schools is made, then the usual reward system was probably in operation, individual competition.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Clearly the outcomes of school desegregation have not been overwhelmingly positive. School desegregation has not automatically led to integration. The studies of contact in school settings which were reviewed in the last section show that in many cases such contact has had negative consequences.

The problem is to integrate the preceding body of social science theory and research findings into a coherent whole in order to conceptualize the processes by which a school moves from desegregation to integration. The review of the literature leads one to hypothesize that such a transition can be accomplished under the following conditions:

1) the groups possess equal status
2) the groups function in a cooperatively interdependent manner to achieve superordinate goals.

Desegregation provides the opportunity for contact through the physical mixing of different ethnic groups. However, in most cases desegregation provides for contact between groups whose status positions are vastly unequal in society as a whole, i.e. lower-class blacks and middle-class whites. Social scientists have very little control over the groups to be desegregated and thus very little control over the external status positions of the groups. What can be influenced are the status positions within the contact situation. The normative relations of the school as a social system can be structured by the authorities so that every student is treated as an equal to every

other student within the school setting. This situation differs from "being" equal in the perception of other students, however.

Desegregation combined with enforcement of equalitarian norms by school personnel provides the opportunity for equal status contact. But clearly the review of the literature has shown that by itself the opportunity for equal status contact is not enough. Such contact must actually take place and during the contact the ethnic group members must function in a cooperatively interdependent manner to achieve superordinate goals.

Unfortunately, as Coleman has shown, the present classroom reward structure works against such cooperative interaction. In fact, it actively promotes competitive distance which is detrimental to the reduction of inter-ethnic hostility. Therefore, it is hypothesized that the school normative system should be changed in order to promote integration through cooperative interdependence by changing classroom grouping procedures and the classroom reward structure.

If students in classes compete as individuals for grades, then members of different ethnic groups may not interact with each other. The opportunity for equal status contact may not actually produce such contact. At least it is not to the advantage of an individual member of one ethnic group to interact with an individual member of another ethnic group. Arranging students in work teams within the classroom, with each team containing members of the different ethnic groups, increases the possibility for interaction between members of different ethnic groups. Such a classroom grouping procedure should tend to actualize equal status contact not merely provide the opportunity.

If grades or other rewards are dispensed within the classroom on an individual basis, then it is probable that the interaction within the work teams will be competitive in nature. However, if grades or other rewards are dispensed within the classroom based upon the accomplishments of the work teams, then it becomes functional for the members of those work teams to cooperate internally. It becomes advantageous for an academically superior member of a team to help his less academically proficient team member, regardless of ethnic group, achieve at a higher level. It also becomes advantageous for an academically inferior member to help his academically superior teammate, regardless of ethnic group, achieve at the highest level. If rewards are distributed on a team basis, then no individual, no matter how proficient, can obtain the highest reward possible on his own. This change in the classroom reward structure creates an interdependence within the work team which makes it functional for such teams to cooperate internally while competing as a team externally. If a work team is to achieve the superordinate goal of being the most academically proficient team in the class, its members must function in a cooperatively interdependent manner.

Social science research indicates that the "most intragroup Likeability and the most Positivity of behavior" can be achieved when rewards are distributed within the work teams, after having been distributed between them, based on member contributions to the accomplishment of the team's goals (Samuels, 1970). Proportional distribution of rewards within the work team based upon member contribution prevents resentment of the low achievers by the higher achievers and lessens the guilt feelings of the less academically proficient for receiving more reward than they earned.

These changes in classroom grouping procedures and the classroom reward structure should create in-group feelings in the members of the various work teams, feelings which cut across ethnic memberships. In other words, if one's work team contains members of various ethnic groups, then so should one's in-group. Sherif's research (1961) indicates that positive in-group feelings form before negative attitudes toward an out-group develop. Therefore, if the composition of the academic work teams changes from class to class and/or periodically within the same class, then positive in-group feelings can develop without allowing time for negative out-group attitudes to form.

These changes in classroom grouping procedures and the classroom reward structure, which are based on social science theory and research findings, should facilitiate the passage of a school from desegregation to integration. They should enlarge one's conception of his in-group to include members of ethnic groups other than one's own.

FOOTNOTES

[1] A notable exception to this oversight has been the work of McClendon (1974) and McClendon & Eitzen (1975). However, Sherif (1976) is not in total agreement with the use they make of his theory.

[2] For a more comprehensive review of the literature on competition versus cooperation than is presented here, see Johnson & Johnson (1974).

References

Allport, G.W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Amir, Y. Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71, 319-342.

Armor, D.J. The evidence on busing. The Public Interest, 1972, 28, 90-126.

Berger, J., Cohen, B., & Zelditch, M. Jr. Status conceptions and social interaction. American Sociological Review, 1972, 37, 241-255.

Boocock, S.S. An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning. Boston: Hougton Mifflin, 1954.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two Worlds of Childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R. New York: Basic Books-Russell Sage Foundations, 1970.

Brophy, I.N. The luxury of anti-negro prejudice. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1945, 9, 456-466.

Campbell, E.Q. Some social psychological correlates of direction in attitude change. Social Forces, 1958, 36, 335-340.

Carithers, M.W. School desegregation and racial cleavage, 1954-1970. Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 26, 25-47.

Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (Eds.) Group Dynamics: Research and Theory (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Cohen, E. Interracial interaction disability. Human Relations, 1972, 25, 9-24.

Cohen, E. G. Modifying the effects of social structure. American Behavioral Scientist, 1973, 16, 861-879.

Cohen, E.G., Lockheed, M.E. & Lohman, M.R. The center for interracial cooperation: a field experiment. Sociology of Education, 1976, 49, 47-58.

Cohen, E.G. & Roper, S.S. Modification of interracial interaction disability: an application of status characteristic theory. American Sociological Review, 1972, 37, 643-657.

Coleman, J. S. Academic achievement and the structure of competition. Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, 330-351.

Coleman, J.S. The Adolescent Society. Glencoe: Free Press, 1961.

Deutsch, M. The effects of cooperation and competition upon group process. Pp. 461-482 in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (eds.), Group Dynamics: Research & Theory (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Deutsch, M. & Collins, M.E. Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951.

DeVries, D. L. & Edwards, K.J. Learning games and student teams: their effects on classroom process. American Educational Research Journal, 1973, 10, 307-318.

DeVries, D.L. & Edwards, K.J. Student teams and learning games: their effects on cross-race and cross-sex interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 741-749.

Dunn, R.E. & Goldman, M. Competition and noncompetition in relationship to satisfaction and feelings toward own-group and nongroup members. Journal of Social Psychology, 1966, 68, 299-311.

Freese, L. & Cohen, B. P. Eliminating status generalization. Sociometry, 1973, 36, 177-193.

Gottheil, E. Changes in social perceptions contingent upon competing or cooperating. Sociometry, 1955, 17, 132-137.

Harding, J. & Hogrefe, R. Attitudes of white department store employees toward negro co-workers. Journal of Social Issues, 1952, 8, 18-28.

Harding, J. et al. Prejudice and ethnic relations. Pp. 1021-1061 in Gardner Lindzey (ed.), The Handbook of Social Psychology (1st ed.), Volume II. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Harris, L. Busing Opposed. The Charlotte Observer, Friday, October 3, 1975, 13A.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R. T. Instructional goal structure: cooperative, competitive, or individualistic. Review of Educational Research, 1974, 44, 213-240.

Julian, J.W., Bishop, D. W., & Fiedler, F. E. Quasi-therapeutic effects of intergroup competition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 321-327.

Julian, J.W. & Perry, F. A. Cooperation contrasted with intra-group and inter-group competition. Sociometry, 1967, 30, 79-90.

Kephart, W. M. Racial Factors and Urban Law Enforcement. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957.

Kramer, B. M. Residential Contact as a Determinant of Attitudes toward Negroes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1950, cited in John Harding, et. al., 1954, p. 1053; cited in Allport, 1954, pp. 257-258.

Lewis, R. & St. John, N. Contributions of cross-racial friendship to minority group achievement in desegregated classrooms. Sociometry, 1974, 37, 79-91.

Lohman, M. R. Changing a racial status ordering: some implications for integration efforts. Education and Urban Society, 1972, 4, 383-402.

McClendon, M.J. Interracial contact and the reduction of prejudice. Sociological Focus, 1974, 7, 47-65.

McClendon, M. J. & Eitzen, D. S. Interracial contact on collegiate basketball teams: a test of Sherif's theory of superordinate goals. Social Science Quarterly, 1975, 55, 926-938.

McPartland, J. The Segregated Student in Desegregated Schools: Sources of Influence on Negro Secondary Students. Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University, 1968, Report No. 21, cited in St. John, 1975.

Moskos, C. C., Jr. Racial integration in the armed forces. American Journal of Sociology, 1966, 72, 132-148.

Myers, A. Team competition, success, and the adjustment of group members. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 325-332.

Palmore, E. B. The introduction of negroes into white departments. Human Organization, 1955, 14, 27-28.

Pettigrew, T. F. Racially Separate or Together? New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Rokeach, M. & Mezei, L. Race and shared belief as factors in social choice. Science, 1966, 151, 167-172.

St. John, N. H. De facto segregation and interracial association in high school. Sociology of Education, 1964, 37, 326-344.

St. John, N. H. School Desegregation Outcomes for Children. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1975.

Samuels, F. The intra-and-inter-competitive group. The Sociological Quarterly, 1970, 11, 391-397.

Sherif, M. On the application of superordinate goals theory. Social Science Quarterly, 1975, 56, 510-513.

Sherif, M. et. al. Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiement. Norman, Oklahoma: Institute of Group Relations, University of Oklahoma, 1961.

Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. Groups in Harmony and Tension. New York: Harper and Row, 1953.

Stouffer, S. A. et. al. Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Volume I, The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Webster, S. W. The influence of interracial contact on social acceptance in a newly integrated school. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1961, 52. 292-296.

Weinberg, M. Desegregation Research: An Appraisal (2nd ed.) Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1970a.

Weinberg, M. The Education of the Minority Child: A Comprehensive Bibliography of 10,000 Selected Entries. Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1970b.

Williams, J. A. Reduction of tension through intergroup contact: a social psychological interpretation. Pacific Sociological Review, 1964, 7, 81-88.

Williams, R. M., Jr. The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947.

Wilner, D. M., Walkley, R. P., & Cook, S. W. Residential proximity and intergroup relations in public housing projects. Journal of Social Issues, 1952, 8, 45-69.

Winder, A. E. White attitudes towards negro-white interaction in an area of changing racial composition. American Psychologist, 1952, 7, 330-331.

Wodarski, J. S., Hamblin, R. L., Buckholdt, D. R., & Ferritor, D. E. Individual consequences versus different shared consequences contingent on the performance of low-achieving group members. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1973, 3, 276-290.

Works, E. The prejudice-interaction hypothesis from the point of view of the negro minority group. American Jounral of Sociology, 1961, 67, 47-52.

Yarrow, M. R., Campbell, J. D., & Yarrow, L. J. Acquisition of new norms: a study of racial desegregation. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14, 8-28.